2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

585 also speak to the couple on subsequent occasions, perhaps on the birth of a child (M.B.).

591 The place of residence of a newly married couple is something of a puzzle. In the nineteenth century it was temporarily patrilocal or matrilocal (bilocal), with friends, or by themselves (neolocal).[66] This was probably not true in early historic times; the evidence favors matrilocality. All sources are agreed that the Delawares were polygynous.[65]

595 Polygyny seems to have been more frequent in the early days. "An *Indian* may have two wives or more if he please, but it is not much in use as it was since the English came amongst them they being ready in some measure to imitate the *English* in things both good & bad."[66] Van der Donck said that "ordinarily they have but one wife, sometimes two or three, but this is generally among the chiefs."[67] The sororate [587] was sometimes practiced, and informants added that the levirate was known.[68] Trowbridge said that "many instances have been known where a man having married a widow also married her daughter, and this has sometimes been at the suggestion of the mother herself."[69]

586 Divorce.— Divorce was easy among the Delawares; either member of a marriage partnership could break the union.[70] Reasons for divorce were sterility, adultery, and any other type of incompatibility.[71] Divorce was not frequent when there were children, and in this event small children remained with the mother.[72] Heckewelder quoted a Delaware on marriage and divorce, and the account is both enlightening and entertaining:

> The Indians had not only a much easier way of getting a wife than the whites, but were also more certain of getting a good one; "For" (said he in his broken English), "White man court, — court, — may be one whole year! O may be two year before he marry! — well! — may be then got very good wife — but may be not! — may be very cross! — Well now, suppose cross! scold so soon as get awake in morning! scold all day! scold until sleep! — all one; he must keep him! White people have law forbidding throwing away wife, be he ever so cross! no! no! Squaw know too well what Indian do if he cross! — throw him away and take another! Squaw love to eat meat! no husband! no meat! Squaw do every thing to please husband! he do the same to please Squaw! live happy!"[73]

684 837 [834] Marital fidelity on the part of men does not seem to have been a major social goal, particularly during a woman's pregnancy, menstruation, and lactation, when marital relations were forbidden.[74] During this period many husbands apparently had concubines. There is one report of the social sanction of a woman's divorce from an adulterous husband. In this isolated case the husband was accused before the chief; he was

[66] Zeisberger, 1910, p. 78; O.A., N.D.
[67] Holm, 1834, p. 126; Loskiel, 1794, p. 58; Trowbridge MS., O.A., M.B., N.D.
[68] Denton, 1845, p. 9.
[69] Van der Donck, 1909, p. 202.
[70] Zeisberger, 1910, p. 88; O.A., M.B.
[71] Trowbridge MS.
[72] De Vries, 1909, p. 218; Holm, 1834, p. 126; Brainerd, 1884, pp. 171-72; Trowbridge MS.
[73] Denton, 1845, p. 9; Zeisberger, 1910, p. 85; Heckewelder, 1881, p. 154; Trowbridge MS.
[74] De Rasieres, 1909, p. 108; Trowbridge MS; O.A.
[75] Heckewelder, 1881, p. 161.
[76] Penn, 1912, p. 232; Zeisberger, 1910, p. 80.

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

428 longed to the man, and bring it to one place. The friends do not keep a single article, for they wish to forget the dead and are afraid lest the smallest part of the property of the deceased should remind them of him. They give what the deceased has left to their friends and no one of his friends receives anything; even though he should wish to take something he will not do it through fear of the others. If a dying Indian leaves his gun or any other trifle to a particular friend the legatee is immediately put in possession and no one disputes his right. The widow gets nothing, yet whatever the husband has given to his wife during his life-time remains her property. Therefore we need not wonder that a married Indian pair should not have their goods in common, for otherwise the wife would be left wholly destitute after her husband's death. In like manner the husband inherits nothing when his wife dies.

768 According to ancient custom a widow should not marry again within a year after the death of her husband, for the In-
● 587 dians say that he does not forsake her before that time. At the end of this period, however, they believe that his soul goes to its place. A widow must endeavor to live by her own industry. She is not permitted to purchase any meat, for the Indians are superstitiously persuaded that their guns fail if a widow should eat of the game they have killed. Now and then a kind friend will venture to transgress the rule and give her some meat secretly. As soon as the first year of her widowhood is passed, the friends of the deceased husband clothe and provide for her and her children. They also propose another husband if they know of a desirable party, or, at least, tell her that she is now at liberty to choose for herself. If, however, she has not attended to the prescribed rule but married within the year, they never trouble themselves about her again except, perhaps, to speak evil of her.

626

If a man's wife die, her relatives pretend to have some claim upon him until a year has passed. If he has remained a widower during that time they generally secure him a wife, preferring a sister of the departed, if one be living.

764 The burying places are at some distance from the towns. Before they had hatchets and other tools they used to line the

584 Marriage arrangements were always simple, but it was definitely considered better form for the negotiations to take place between the two sets of parents rather than between the individuals concerned. In this type of negotiation, the man's mother took animal food which he had killed to the girl's mother; according to some sources, a [431] return gift was made of corn food prepared by the girl (Harrington, 1908, p.215; Heckewelder, 1881, pp.161-72; Zeisberger, 1910, p.78). It was not unusual, however, for the agreement to take place directly between the boy and girl in which case they might or might not go through these formalities. Loskiel, who is the only author who mentions the subject of residence after marriage, says that the 591 newly married couple often lived with friends for a short time until they built their own house (Loskiel, p.56).

462 The man was responsible for building the house and providing axes, hoes, canoes, dishes and household equipment although the girl might supply some things. The man was expected to support the family by hunting, trapping and fishing, and the game which he brought home was the property of his wife to use as she saw fit. She was equally responsible, however, for agricultural produce and cooking; and if she were remiss, might be reminded of her neglect by her husband's taking to the woods without telling her he planned to do so. She also carried packs in traveling, tanned skins and fetched wood (Penn, p.30; Heckewelder, 1881, pp. 155-160; G.Thomas, p.341).

586 There was apparently no strong pressure put upon the couple to remain together after they were married. Although later writers state that marriages were formerly more stable, they present no [595] evidence to substantiate this. Polygyny was permitted but infrequent (Heckewelder, 1881, p.154; Harrington, 1913, p.215; Zeisberger, 1910, pp.78-9; Loskiel, p.57). After the death of a spouse, the 768 widow or widower, but more particularly the former, was expected 587 to remain single for a year, but it is clear that this was frequently not done (Brickell, p.49; Loskiel, p.121).

Social Life and Organization

648 Most of Delaware social behavior is a closed book to us as 431 the early observers did not usually have long contacts with them in their villages. The early writers were aware, however, that the 574 Indian expected to be fed when he visited them, and that they were always offered food when they visited him. Likewise they noted that gifts passed readily from hand to hand among the Indians although property rights were clearly understood (Lindstrom p.233; Danckaerts, pp.80 and 159; Penn, p.32).

525 The following games were probably played in this early period: [526] footraces (lindstrom, p.191); a gambling game in which flat bones,

141.	Any superiority among wives				+	+	−			+	−	
142.	strongest				+							
143.	oldest									+		
144.	youngest					+						
145.	Polyandry				−	−	−			−	−	
146.	Sororate — polygynous				+	+	−	−	−	−	+	
147.	Sororate — successive			+	+	+	+	−	+	+	−	
148.	Sororate — obligatory				*+	−	+	*+	−	−	+	
149.	Marriage of man to woman and daughter				+	+	+	−	−	−	·	
150.	Adultery criminal in the woman	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
151.	Equally so in the man		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	
152.	Punished only by separation	+	−	(−)	+	+	+	(+)	+	+	−	
153.	Divorce on grounds of infidelity	+	+		+	+	+		−			
154.	Without any particular cause	+	+		+	+	+					
155.	May be limited by husband		+		+	+	+					
156.	by wife		+		+	+	+					
157.	Women seldom get divorce				+	+	+			−		
158.	Children stay with mother until able to choose for themselves		+	+	+	+	•	+		+	*+	
159.	Marriage with near relatives prohibited to very remote degree of relationship					+	+					
160.	to any known degree			+	+	·	·	+	+	+	+	
161.	Cohabitation without marriage common		+		+	·	·	−	−	−	+	
162.	Do individuals live to advanced age without being married				+	+	+	−	·	−	+	
163.	Commonly				−	−	−		−	−	−	
164.	Common for unmarried women to have children		+		+	+	+	−	−	−	+	
165.	Injurious to their reputations		+		+	*+	+			−	−	
166.	Are they punished		−			−	−	+		−	−	
167.	Affect chances of marriage		−		−	−		+		+	+	
168.	Proportion of married women without children †			•	*4-5	3	·	12	12	12	4-5	8-10
169.	Average number of children in family					2-3	·	2	2	1	2-3	2+
170.	Average interval between births (yrs.)										18-	
171.	Age women generally begin to bear children					16	·	16	30	21	20	20
172.	Age to cease					40	·	40	50+	70	·	50
					18-	15-					18-	17+
173.	Age that men commonly get married		•	•	20	25	F30	20	25	25	21	F20
					14-						16-	17+
174.	Age that women commonly get married		•		16	·	F24	20	20	20	21	F20

585 886 844 588 536 582 837 517 585

+ = element present
− = element denied
(+) or (−) = source ambiguous
* = informant could not or would not say
§ = some, sometimes, or several
† or * = see Ethnographic Notes, pp. 79-137 for additional information

	Williams	Van der Donck	Lindeström	Zeisberger	Heckewelder	Johnston	Pipe	Chippe	J. W.	W. T.	E. R.	W. L.
Death and its incidents †												
175. Treatment of corpse. Eyes closed		+				+	(+)		+	+	+	+
176. Limbs straightened		+				+	(+)		+	+	+	+
177. Washed						+	+	+	+	+	+	+
178. Dressed				+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
179. Painted				+	+				+	+	+	*+
180. By unrelated persons		−			(+)	·	+	·	+	−	+	*+
181. Kept ___ nights before burial		8	8	(1)	1	1	1	*1-4	1	1	1	1-3
182. Burial	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
183. Extended		*−	*−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
184. Grave depth ___ feet						3-4	3	5	5-6	4	4-5	3½-4
185. Grave lined with bark		+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
186. Grave goods of clothes only required	+	−	−	+	−	+	+	+	−	+	+	+
187. Post at head of graves of males only				−	−	·	+	·	−	−	−	−
188. Cremation					−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
189. Take up bones and reinter			•		−	5	−	−	−	−	−	−
190. Collection of people at burial, thanks to bystanders for assistance		+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
191. Chief prays that soul may go happy						·	·	+	+	+	+	+
192. Feast at the grave							+		+			
193. Feast and moccasin game night before burial									+	+	+	+
194. Mourning. Widow or widower observes for ___ months	3-12	12	*12	12		·	*9	9	*12	*12	12	·
195. Lets hair grow loose and unkempt		*−		+			+		+	+	+	+
196. Wears black	+	+					−	+	·	−	·	−
197. Abstains from games, dances and amusement	+						+		+	+	+	+
198. Does not remarry during mourning	·	+		+		+	+	+	+	*+	+	+
199. Terminated by relatives of deceased washing, giving new clothes, etc.				+		·	+	·	·	+	5	*+
200. Visits grave ___ nights				365	21	6-7	6	·	3	4	·	4
201. Visits grave ___ dawns				365		—	6		—	—	—	—

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

585 The reports of lack of ceremony attending a marriage are quite evidently based on a misunderstanding of what constitutes a ceremony (134). Considered in its meaning of any form, rittal, or custom established for the observance of joining in marriage, there was a ceremony for even the type of marriage described by Chipps. The Delaware ceremony, however, was not a complicated one to judge from the one described by Pipe for former times and appears to have been simplified even further at that time, 1824. The form of marriage of the Delaware then may safely be said to have undergone a lessening of formality by the third period even though most of the former practices were still remembered in the fourth. One of the customs connected with marriage that was not remembered in the fourth period, the exchange of presents, aids in establishing the time of the change in marriage forms (137). Whereas the giving of presents to the bride or the family of the bride (135, 136) was reported in all four periods, the exchange of presents was recorded as a custom in the second period, but one no longer practiced, according to Pipe, in the third period, and completely forgotten in the fourth.

595 Polygyny was not common in any period and was principally confined to chiefs and rich men. There is no consensus among either the sources or the informants as to whether any superiority was observed among the multiple wives or on what quality such a superiority might have been based (141-44). Polyandry was not mentioned in the first two periods, but was emphatically denied in the last two (145). Information on the operation of the levirate is too scanty to warrant any conclusions, but the sororate attracted attention in all but the first period (146-48). Polygynous sororate was reported by all three sources of the third period but denied by all the informants except W. L. His information applied to only one family. Successive sororate was reported in each of the last three periods and the only denial was that of the Canadian Chipps. There may have been a change in the feeling toward polygynous sororate in the last period, but as polygyny was not common in any period and opportunities for polygynous sororal marriages were fewer in the scattered

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

condition of the smaller population of the last century, it is more likely that the custom simply ceased to be active.

In the same way marriage of a man to a woman and her daughter, either simultaneously or successively, was probably never very common and disappeared completely in the fourth period (149). The tabulated information shows a complete break between the sources and the informants. As the latter simply deny knowing of any such cases, now or in the past, and have no knowledge of any rule prohibiting such marriages, lack of opportunity is probably as much responsible as any change in viewpoint.

Divorce and allied considerations apparently have undergone little change in recent years from the point of view of the Delaware even with the superimposition of the legal code of the whites (153-58). W. T. in his very idealistic view of Delaware customs said children were brought up to mind their parents and that this behavior continued through life. Hence, in marriage a boy and girl had no choice but to do what parents decided. A girl then could not leave her husband because her parents had given her to the man in exchange for presents. He implied that the husband was not bound quite as much to continue a distasteful marriage, and, also, that after the death of the parents the girl could act more according to choice. E. R. and W. L. said that women seldom obtained a divorce, but according to J. W., whose son was recently divorced, the woman was chivalrously allowed to do the divorcing even if the husband was the wronged party. In his son's case the Delaware customs were observed as well as the legal steps. The wife had been running around with other men and drinking. After several of her protracted absences from home, Fred decided upon a divorce. He waited until she came home, asked her to pack up her belongings, and then took them and her to her father's home. Her father was already acquainted with the circumstances, but Fred repeated them and announced that he was through with her. Then he instituted legal action but both families already considered the divorce to be in effect.

Information on the two elements, cohabitation without marriage and children born out of wedlock (161 and 164), follows

9: Kinietz E-4, 5 (1938) 1946
NM7 Delaware NM7

592 who generally form the same family, the youngest having the
595 husband's preference. But if they cannot agree to live together they reside in separate cabins and receive the visits of the husband when he deigns to make them.

CAPTAIN CHIPPS—Polygamy is common with the rich—but "one woman is generally a match for a man," and with the poor, there is never more than one. If a man has several wives, he treats them equally well—they compose one family.

J. W. refused to comment on polygamy, while W. T. denied that there were ever any cases.

W. L. said that a person might have two or three wives but did not do so commonly. Reported that Sam White Turkey had three. Children by each were considered members of one family.

148. Polygynous sororate obligatory

595 JOHN JOHNSTON—If the man appears to regret the loss of his
587 wife and shuns the intercourse of women for a number of months, the relatives of the deceased will present him a suit of new clothes and give him to wife a sister or some other relative of his former wife, the same mode is adopted with regard to the women.

W. T. said both sororate and levirate if the relatives of the deceased insisted, but not otherwise.

158. Following divorce children stay with mother

586 CAPTAIN CHIPPS—If they have children, the parent to whom they are most attached takes and provides for them—there is no equal division of children.

W. L.—Children might stay with mother although father often kept boys.

165. Illegitimate children injurious to reputation of mother

848 CAPTAIN PIPE—So far as regards the reputation of women who have children without being married it is affected much as that of the whites. They secure to themselves a good deal of contempt and worthless fellows for their husbands.

168. Proportion of married women without children

842 ZEISBERGER, CAPTAIN CHIPPS, J. W., and E. R. all said the proportion of women without children was unknown. HECKE-